



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

One of the most touching episodes is the appearance of a girl who repeatedly asks her way to Lonua. She is crazed by grief, since her people were destroyed when the Prussians set fire to the little village Lonua. One of the most impressive scenes contains no characters of importance and no plot element. Four women are huddled together, terrified by the approaching fire. Page after page might have been written by Maeterlinck himself, there is so much of atmospheric effect produced by iteration, here natural from stress of emotion. "It is burning and burning and there is no end to the fire" is repeated again and again until there comes the cry to God for mercy. The play concludes with a noble prophecy made by the patriot Grelieu to his wife: "I swear by God: Belgium will live! God has given me the light to see and I can see. Songs will resound here, Jeanne! . . . There will be no more bloodshed. I see a new world, Jeanne! I see my nation. Here it is advancing with palm leaves to meet God, who has come to earth again. Weep, Jeanne, you are a mother! Weep, unfortunate mother. God weeps with you. But

there will be happy mothers here again. I see a new world, Jeanne; I see a new life!" Certainly, in the midst of despair, here is a courageous vision of the future.

Is it a great drama? As a unified work of art, it is obviously inferior to the author's "Anathema," or even to his sparkling little satire, "Love of One's Neighbor." But "The Sorrows of Belgium" and the host of other plays which will inevitably follow in its wake will be important documents for the social historian of this tumultuous era.

The most remarkable feature of the plays about war written just before or just after the war of 1914 is their unanimous denunciation of war. Playwrights of the belligerent and the neutral nations have devoted their energies to the unmasking of the contemptible causes of war, as well as its devastating effects. War plays today are peace plays, and the best of them are more potent than the most cogent of pacifist exhortations, because they first make us feel, and thus they compel us to think.

THE SCHOOL AS AN AGENCY FOR PEACE

By BENJAMIN GLASSBERG

IF THE people were not carefully trained in military ideals war could be abolished. We would be approaching universal peace, even though the economic motives were just as potent as they are at present. To accomplish this we must concentrate our efforts upon the institution mainly responsible for the ideas and feelings instilled in the young—the schools.

Preaching peace has accomplished little because it begins at too late a stage in man's development. The ideal of brotherhood presented does not sink deep enough in the mind of man. It comes at an age when man's ideas are almost all formed. Consequently this ideal is easily erased. The veneer of internationalism rubs off when it clashes with the spirit of nationalism.

It is, therefore, with the youth that we must begin. Then the mind is in its most receptive stage. It is plastic and easily molded. The impressions made during this period usually adhere throughout life. The agencies at work producing these impressions are the home, the gang, the church, and the school. With the spread of compulsory education throughout the world the school is becoming more and more the greatest single factor in modifying and directing the instincts and ideas of the future men and women of the country.

What ideas are the schools giving the children concerning wars, heroes, and foreign countries? Are they making any attempt to inspire a feeling of friendship for the peoples of other nations? Are the children taught to realize how much civilization is indebted to the contributions of the nations of the world, of which their country is one? Or are they being impressed with the spirit of narrow nationalism, of the superiority of their country's institutions and customs and fed with maxims such as "My country, right or wrong"?

In the German schools the largest element in the history teaching is the development of patriotism. The

purpose of history teaching, says Professor Bourne, quoting from the book of instructions given to teachers in Germany, is to "display to the child the beneficent striving and successes of our noble princely family, the great deeds of our people, in order to implant in the hearts of the children love and holy enthusiasm for Emperor, King, People, and Fatherland." In upper grades "the services of the Prussian rulers in promoting the welfare of the people are to be especially emphasized," and that unquestioning obedience to their ruler is the prime duty of every German.

The history teaching in the French schools has likewise in view the inculcating of narrow national patriotism. "The instructions which accompanied the history program of 1891 declared it to be the function of history to give the student a clear notion both of his 'duties as a Frenchman and of his duties as a man!'" Need one doubt that one of the sacred duties of all Frenchmen is to recover Alsace-Lorraine from the inveterate enemy of all Frenchmen?

In Russia, Italy, and the other nations the same spirit pervades the school system. In our own country our children are made to feel from their earliest school days the infinite superiority of America and American ideas. They are imbued with a feeling of contempt for anything foreign. From the earliest grades the child is taught to know the heroes of the nation. And who are the heroes we so assiduously hold up as ideals for our youths? Are they the conquerors of the destructive forces of nature? Are they the inventors who have conferred inestimable benefits upon humanity? Or are they the victors over pain and disease, the martyrs in the fight against injustice, poverty, and greed?

By no means. The hero that the child is given to worship is the man on horseback or the man behind the gun. The warrior is the hero par excellence. The

board of superintendents of the New York city schools who had been instructed to designate the schools with names in place of numbers included forty generals in their list. Generals, they thought, were the most appropriate heroes for the boys and girls.

Educational theorists have encouraged this militaristic training by insisting that children can be made interested only in battles. High-sounding theories have been invented to provide their beliefs with a scientific foundation. We have, for instance, the "culture epoch theory," which maintains very plausibly that just as the embryo goes through all the stages in the evolution of man from the lower species, so the child goes through all the cultural stages in the development of man, from savagery to civilization. So they say it is natural for the little boy to want a gun and attempt to go through the motions of shooting his playfellow.

These theorists fail to realize that it is natural for the child to be interested in the things he hears most about. He will be interested in the warrior heroes we feed him on if we feed him on no other heroes. If we choose to tell him about war and buy him toy cannons and rifles and pistols need we be surprised if he delights in using them?

"Our whole patriotic oratory, much of our art, and more of our education, are directed to arouse patriotic passions," says Professor Boaz, of Columbia University. "We do not praise heroic devotion to ideals that our intellect supports, but heroic deed; we flatter our nation by making her believe in her superiority over all others; we nourish the conviction that the promotion of our own interests at the expense of other nations is a laudable policy. Our greatness, our excellence, are the themes on which imagination is fed, and from which develops the emotional international attitude that is still common to mankind."

The youth naturally feels that the only way properly to serve his country is to fight for it, to die for it, for "*dulce et decorum est pro patria mori*." It is this kind of training that explains why Colonel Roosevelt can find such widespread acceptance of doctrines such as he expresses in his article on the Monroe Doctrine. "Popular sentiment is just when it selects as popular heroes the men who have led in the struggle against malice domestic or foreign levy. No triumph of peace is quite so great as the supreme triumphs of war. . . . It is through strife or the readiness for strife that a nation must win greatness."

With such ideas prevalent throughout the nation we can do little for universal peace by forbidding the President and Congress to declare war except by a referendum vote of the people. For a citizenry bred upon military ideals and in matters of war accustomed to accept the promptings of the so-called leaders and false patriots who desire war, a referendum would but serve to record the blindness of the nation. The power to declare war should certainly be lodged in the hands of those who do the fighting. But we should remember that the Spanish-American war was practically forced upon the government by popular opinion inflamed by newspaper scareheads.

If we are to have a body of men and women who will not be swept off their feet by the waving of the flag and anxious to "lick" some "inferior" nation, we must

change the character of the teaching in our schools. Let us try to teach respect for other nations instead of scorn. Let us point out the achievements of England, France, Germany, Italy, and Russia in literature, art, painting, music, science, invention, industry, and commerce. Let us tell them how within a period of fifty years Japan has been able to accomplish what the rest of the world has done in centuries. Let us give them a sympathetic description of Chinese civilization and show them that a people can live their life happily without factories and subways and skyscrapers. Let us explain what it is that the unfortunate Mexicans are fighting for; why they need our help and sympathy. We may thus perhaps approach the feeling of brotherhood.

In the teaching of our own history we must stop reading right and justice into every war we have fought. Let us boldly point out where we have been at fault and why. We must cease to flaunt before the eyes of youth the red-stained banner of war and tell them instead the stories of the heroes of literature, invention, and industry. Let us tell them the stories of Bret Harte, Walt Whitman, or Mark Twain. Those who have done so know how interested the children are in them. We can thrill them with stories of the work of Colonels Gorgas and Goethals—military men, yes, who have won glory in the service of peace. The story of Edison is enough to make every boy ransack the books and magazines in the libraries to find out some more details of the work of this marvelous man. The same is true with the lives of Morse and Bell, Whitney and Howe, Fulton and Marconi, Carrell and Pasteur, to select at random some of the benefactors of mankind. What braver men can we present to children than Lovejoy, Garrison, Wendell Phillips, or Tom Paine?

Take the child on a trip to the woods with Agassiz instead of following the campaign of a general whose highest duty it is to murder as many of his brothers as he can for the glory of his country. Or, better still, let him follow with you the expeditions of Lewis and Clark in the great Northwest, or Pere Marquette and La Salle down the Mississippi. Or take him with Greeley and Peary in the Arctic snows or with Livingstone and Stanley in the heart of the Dark Continent, and the child will find all the fascination, all the romance and bravery, and all that stirring of the soul that human slaughter is supposed to possess.

The story of the chaining of a torrent to turn the wheels of a factory; the building of a levee to hold back the destructive forces of a swollen stream; the construction of dams and irrigating systems so that desert lands may bloom with vegetation and life; the cleaning up of a pest hole filled with malaria and yellow fever—all these are far more thrilling than the sickening stories of battlefields.

Those who think history and wars are synonymous terms will perhaps fear that such a training will necessitate throwing history overboard. This is by no means necessary. Wars, after all, constitute a large portion of history. But the very study of wars can be turned to good account in impressing the love of peace. That can be done by pointing out the reasons—or the lack of reasons—for wars, the costs of wars, and the terribly destructive results. Such a training should be supplemented by what Professor James calls "The Moral

Equivalent of War." "Instead of military conscription there should be a conscription of the whole youthful population to form for a certain number of years a part of the army enlisted against nature. . . . The military ideals of hardihood and discipline would be wrought into the growing fibre of the people."

Only by teaching peace can we have peace. It is possible to teach peace today. In every school throughout the land we can begin to show that peace and not war is necessary for civilization; that we can live heroically for our country and serve her better than by dying for her. We can make the youth understand that the man of most worth is he who has done something to lighten the labor

of others; who has increased their happiness; who has decreased their pain; who has broadened their appreciation for the beauty of man and nature. He will clearly see that war, except it be for national independence, is merely organized destruction. He will have a deep contempt for him who relies upon the belching of cannon and piercing of bayonets to settle questions of right and wrong.

And then when some discerning few wish to hurl their nation against another the citizens trained in the ideals of peace will regard these traitors with astonishment and disgust, and remain steadfast in the glorious paths of peace.

COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING FOR BOYS IN AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND. DO WE WANT IT?

By WILLIAM C. ALLEN

COMPULSORY military training of lads fourteen years old and upward in Australia, and sixteen years old and upward in New Zealand, has been so thoroughly exploited in some quarters that an investigation into the practical operation of such a system, or its dangers, is justifiable at the present time.

Compulsory military training is claimed by some of its advocates to be different from conscription, but in practical operation it proves to be the same. The Defense Act of New Zealand of 1909 was made possible by the agitation of the National Defense League and by influences originating in England. The visit of the United States fleet to Australia resulted in a great wave of military enthusiasm spreading over that land, and one of the developments connected therewith was the demand to arm. The result of a combination of circumstances, seized by the militarists to their own aggrandizement "without any direct reference to the will of the people," and backed at first by some well-meaning educators, was that the men of those countries put their defenseless boys under military discipline to which the voters would not themselves pretend to submit.

Figures supplied by Arthur Watts, organizer of the Australian Freedom League, revealed extraordinary conditions. Even registrations were difficult to get. He shows that in Australia in 1913, despite the fact that the military officers had power to register boys without their parents' consent, the number liable to prosecution for non-registration at the end of the registration period was 7,324.

Official figures quoted in the "Melbourne Age of 31st of May, 1911," disclosed that to that date the total average attendance for Australia at the statutory parade drills was 59,562 out of the total strength of 88,859 senior cadets (18 years old and under) stated by the

military authorities to be in actual training. The percentage of absentees from drill ranged from about 31 to 52 per cent. The "Age" adds: "It is plain that large numbers of cadets are shirking their legal obligations."

There have been very many prosecutions of boys under the system which in both countries is known as the Defense Acts. Non-attendance at drill from almost whatever cause necessarily constitutes a basis for prosecution. In the city of Auckland, New Zealand, of about 90,000 population, during the twelve months ending at an early date last year, there were, not counting withdrawn cases, a record of 770 prosecutions. There are reported, for instance, as many as 50 defense prosecutions in the police court of the little city of Invercargill, N. Z., at one time.

The administration of prosecutions has been very severe in many cases. The act in both countries provided alternative services and assumed relief for members of denominations opposed to military service, but no relief for the many others who resisted drill because of religious or other conscientious principles. Here are a very few sample prosecutions reported:

Sydney Crossland, a Quaker lad, was, on account of religious scruples, sentenced to fifty days' detention in Victoria Barracks, Sydney being released before half the time had expired. The Minister for Defense is reported as saying that immediate action would be taken to punish the "unruly" cadet. He was visited in a cell by a member of the Freedom League.

"Victor Yeo, a lad of fourteen, was, on August 25, 1913, sentenced to one month in Broken Hill jail. His release was ordered after serving twenty days, but he served the full term, including another imprisonment of twelve days." A good deal of this time he was on bread and water diet, and for ten days of his second imprisonment he was locked up in a cell for twenty-two out of twenty-four hours.

"J. and W. Size made a statutory declaration that in September, 1913," when in detention in Ft. Largs, they were placed on bread and water diet in a cell with a

The writer in this letter not only calls on recent personal observations in the antipodes, but is also indebted to the publications of the New Zealand Freedom League and the Australian Freedom League, "Conscription in New Zealand and Australia," "The Repeal" and others.